Rec 8/27

OE FORM 6000, 2/69

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

ERIC REPORT RESUME

ERIC ACC. NO.	P.A.	PUBL. DATE	ISSUE
ED 040 308			
CH ACC. NO.			
AA 000 582		May 70	RIENOV70

IS DOCUMENT COPYRIGHTED? YES ☐ NO ☒
ERIC REPRODUCTION RELEASE? YES ☐ NO ☒
LEVEL OF AVAILABILITY I ☒ II ☐ III ☐

AUTHOR: Shulman, Carol

TITLE: Compendium Series of Current Research, Programs and Proposals, Number 1: Governance.

SOURCE CODE	INSTITUTION (SOURCE)
bBBC1751	
SP. AG. CODE	SPONSORING AGENCY
RMQ66000	

EDRS PRICE	CONTRACT NO.	GRANT NO.
0.25; 1.35		
REPORT NO.		BUREAU NO.

AVAILABILITY

JOURNAL CITATION

DESCRIPTIVE NOTE 25p.

DESCRIPTORS
*Higher Education; *Research; *Governance; *Research Reviews (Publications); *Institutional Research

IDENTIFIERS

ABSTRACT
This compendium lists and describes 61 ongoing or recently completed studies and programs dealing with college and university governance. Items are listed alphabetically by title and include beginning and expected dates of completion, principal investigator, source of availability and source of funding. An introductory essay discusses trends in governance research and indentifies major topics under investigation: (1) student participation; (2) faculty role; (3) trustee responsibility; (4) institutional goals and planning; and (5) administration problems. Indexes of authors, institutions, and sponsoring agencies are included. (CS)

ED 040 308

COMPENDIUM SERIES OF CURRENT RESEARCH, PROGRAMS AND PROPOSALS

Number 1: GOVERNANCE

Prepared by
Carol Shulman

ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education
The George Washington University
1 Dupont Circle, Suite 630
Washington, D.C. 20036
May 1970

AA 000 582

FOREWORD

The ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education, one of a network of clearinghouses established by the U.S. Office of Education, is concerned with undergraduate, graduate, and professional education. As well as abstracting and indexing significant documents in its field, the Clearinghouse prepares its own and commissions outside works on various aspects of higher education.

One of its current projects is the compilation of compendiums listing ongoing or recently completed research studies and programs in various areas. This compendium, the first in the series, is concerned with governance. Following an introductory essay are brief descriptions of relevant general and institutional studies. Each item is listed alphabetically by title of project and includes: beginning and expected completion dates of the project; the name(s) of the principal investigator(s); the source of availability of the completed report, if one is forthcoming; and the source of funding, if other than the researcher's home institution.

Many of the completed reports will be made available in microfiche and hard/photo copy from the ERIC Document Reproduction Service, National Cash Register Company, 4936 Fairmont Avenue, Bethesda, Maryland 20014. Abstracts of the documents will appear in Research in Education, which is published monthly by the U.S. Office of Education and may be ordered from the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402. Single copies cost $1.75; annual subscriptions, $21.00.

Our next compendium will deal with the preparation of college teachers and will list studies, programs, and proposals for new graduate degrees. Single copies will be available free from the Clearinghouse in June 1970.

Carl J. Lange, Director
ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education
May 1970

CONTENTS

REVIEW 1

COMPENDIUM
- General Studies 5
- Institutional Studies 16

INDEXES
- Authors 22
- Institutions and Sponsoring Agencies 23

This publication was prepared pursuant to a contract with the Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their judgment in professional and technical matters. Points of view or opinions do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

REVIEW

At the heart of many criticisms of colleges and universities is the issue of governance. Hydra-headed, governance may appear in questions of faculty or student power, institutional goals and social involvement, communication gaps, to name a few. Recognizing this, individual researchers and educators, as well as colleges and universities, are currently studying the various topics grouped under governance. For many investigators–institutional committees, individual faculty members, and students alike–governance is an unfamiliar, unexplored area of interest. Frequently, they must acquaint themselves with its literature while trying to solve their own institution's governance problems. On the other hand, more experienced researchers are now faced with a proliferation of studies and activities which must be evaluated in the light of past knowledge and recent experience. This compendium was undertaken to familiarize both old and new investigators with recently completed and ongoing studies in governance, and to encourage researchers to exchange information and avoid duplication of effort.

Democratic trend

An examination of the accompanying compendium indicates there is an increasing awareness of the significance of governance structures–the formal decision-making processes that affect all aspects of campus life. The composition of institutional committees seeking overall changes in governance structures indicates this awareness and reveals a democratic trend in the life of the university. Committees on institutional planning and goals, for example, are now generally composed of representatives from all recognized constituencies in university life: trustees, students, faculty, administrators and alumni (42-61). Recommendations of these committees, in turn, reflect their composition: they call for structures which grant all members of the university community some voice in its administration. Given the pressure for widespread participation, if the committees were drawn from a narrower base, or recommended less representative governance structures, they might find it difficult to gain wide approval for their plans.

Student participation

Many reports focus on individual constituencies in the academic community that will now have a larger voice in governance. Students, the newest factor in more democratic procedures, receive a great deal of attention. Current research describes the expanded role students have played in effecting governance changes. In general, students have rejected student government organizations as ineffective vehicles for participation, and have worked directly with faculty and administrators to gain in the decision-making process. William Deegan (35) observes that "any revitalization of student government must be considered in the broader context of student participation in governance."

In Student Participation in Academic Governance, Robinson and Shoenfeld (37) report increased student involvement in governance at a sample of 120 institutions. Constructive Changes to Ease Campus Tensions (13) documents extensive changes in 90 percent of the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges' member institutions. These changes frequently involve the inclusion of students in areas previously forbidden to them: students are now active in helping to select new presidents at such diverse places as Columbia University and Davidson College (North Carolina), and are serving on boards of trustees at such institutions as the University of Connecticut

and Princeton. Students across the country now also have greater control over their extracurricular activities—an area of traditional concern. Whether the changes are large or small, the reports conclude that sharing power with students is a continuing and increasing trend.

Although so much impetus toward increased student participation would seem to indicate universal agreement, this is not the case. In a provocative dissent, Kingman Brewster (40) suggests that because of lack of interest on the part of most students, new governance structures designed for widespread participation would not be truly democratic, nor would they function as efficiently as desired. What is needed, he urges, is "accountability" of administrators—i.e., administrative responsiveness and responsibility to students and faculty. The practice of "accountable" government would be more compatible with real student attitudes and needs than new decision-making processes. The Southern Regional Education Board has recently begun a study (36) to examine both the pros and cons of student participation in governance as seen by several higher education constituencies, and also to study the viability of several working models.

Faculty role

With the increase in student demands for involvement, faculty members are reconsidering their roles in institutional governance. There seems to be a wealth of studies, many of which duplicate each other. In 1967, the Campus Governance Program prepared a brochure, Faculty Participation in Academic Governance (5). Written by faculty members, this report declares that "an effective system of campus governance should be built on the concept of 'shared authority' between the faculty and the administration." The exclusion of students seems outmoded today, but the report provides a representative view of how faculty members see their role: as participants in deciding campus issues from the budget and educational policy to grades and the curriculum, their traditional domain. The report also advocates strikes against the university when other appeals are exhausted.

Deegan and Mortimer (51) are completing a case study of faculty participation in such matters as personnel, budgetary affairs, and educational policy at the University of Minnesota. Other current research includes sections on the faculty's role in university life (45, 9, 18, 40). McConnell (31) will examine Great Britain's governance patterns, including the relationship of faculty members to governing boards, and he anticipates that some of the findings will be applicable to American colleges and universities. There is no evidence that any of these studies will differ greatly in their findings or recommendations. Perhaps the American Association of University Professors' study on faculty involvement in governance (18) will provide a definitive statement on what form faculty participation should take. It intends to "develop standards for evaluation of faculty participation in institutional government" based on the replies it receives from a questionnaire.

It should be noted that few current studies place emphasis on the problems of the department. Only two projects are dealing with this question (12, 26).

Trustee responsibilities

Because of the multitude of rapid changes occurring at the institutions they oversee, university trustees are reexamining and altering their roles. Morton Rauh's The Trusteeship of Colleges and Universities (5) serves as an effective how-to-be-a-trustee handbook, by describing who trustees are and how they exercise their responsibilities. Based on responses to a questionnaire sent to trustees across the country, the handbook should be useful to the university community at large as well as to trustees.

The North Carolina Board of Higher Education's Duties and Responsibilities of College and University Trustees (15), which is in a manual format, discusses the same questions that Rauh does, but in less detail. Its appendices include pertinent North Carolina statutes and state and local studies. August W. Eberle's study of "Policy Boards and Policy Making in U.S. Higher Education" (30) covers different ground; it provides a complete statistical picture of how all higher education policy boards are organized and function.

Growth and attitudes

Two large-scale projects indicate that researchers are recognizing the need to examine the nature of the changes now taking place—the emerging patterns of governance and their significance for the future growth of colleges and universities. In his study on "Institutions in Transition" (25), Harold Hodgkinson uses questionnaires and US Office of Education data from as far back as 1941 to discern the direction public and private colleges and universities are taking. With respect to one of the most acute problems of governance, Hodgkinson reports that "the exact size of an institution may not be as important as its rate of growth" in explaining the incidence of student protest. The growth rate, he argues, causes "morale problems" that are expressed through protest.

Hodgkinson also notes the trends toward greater student participation in governance and rejection of fraternities and sororities as the mode of participation in campus life. He foresees a conflict between the faculty's desire to maintain rigorous admissions standards—a traditional measurement of quality—and the university's advocacy of increasingly open admissions programs. In resolving this issue, student and faculty gains in decision-making processes will inevitably affect the solution.

The "Institutions in Transition" study looks to the past to understand how changes influence colleges and universities. In contrast, Lyman Glenny's "Project 20" (31) examines the current status of selected institutions in order to develop guidelines for the future. The Project—nine studies dealing with different aspects of governance—is designed "so that the total decision process and its contributing components may be comprehended." The long-range goal is "to develop model structures and processes which will accommodate the diverse interests and needs of the academic family. . . ."

While the reports discussed so far deal with the problems of developing viable governance structures and decision-making processes, other research recognizes that reformed organizational structures cannot by themselves end the criticisms of university procedures. In short, a crucial change in attitudes must accompany changes in structures. Discussing its own judicial system, Cornell University's report (49) notes, "how well [it] will work will depend at least as much on the surrounding campus. . . as on how the system is used." Symptomatic of this increased concern with attitudes is Alexander Astin's "Campus Unrest" project (7) which will study the relationships among faculty attitudes, administrative responses, and the incidence of protest on campus. Other investigators (3, 6, 17, 26, 34, 50) are following a somewhat parallel track, surveying the attitudes of different campus groups toward participation in governance. Their results should be helpful in predicting how successful changes in governance structures will be in improving the quality of campus life.

Institutional goals

The issue of institutional roles and purposes in modern society underlies all controversies over the reform of governance structures. The Assembly on University Goals and Governance (4) stands out

from other governance projects because it is the only one which deals with these fundamental questions, and it does so on a particularly large scale. The Assembly emphasizes discussion: its prospectus states, "The Assembly should be judged less by the paper it generates and more by the processes of deliberation and exchanges it initiates." Its organization reflects this objective. At the heart are five policy councils which represent five ways of considering the university's options: (1) Learning, Teaching, and Evaluation; (2) Relations with Other Institutions; (3) Research and Service; (4) Access, Scale and Quality; (5) Models of Governance. Limited to twenty members each, the policy councils are meeting periodically through 1970 for discussions and will write end-of-the-year papers on their findings. In addition, the directors of the Assembly will commission papers, and the chairman will write his own end-of-the-year report about the Assembly's experiences. In its second year of operation, the Assembly will set up forums and seminars across the country which will involve both the academic and the general communities.

In contrast with the Assembly's discussions, which consider the general problems of universities, other studies deal with the questions of directions and goals, as the bases for specific governance recommendations. Duke University's experience is typical. Before turning to their own institution's problems, Duke's Commission on University Governance (54) examined studies from almost two dozen schools. The Commission had to conclude, however, that "the configuration of governance at Duke University depends most substantially upon Duke's own particular history, practical constraints, and needs." The State University of New York's Panel on University Purposes (46) is a notable exception to this approach. It was established specifically to consider SUNY's future direction, without any particular charge to develop new processes of governance.

Service oriented projects

Institutional studies will undoubtedly benefit from the practical help becoming available to them. In addition to the efforts of the Assembly on University Goals and Governance, the American Association of Higher Education's Campus Governance Program (5) is making plans to arrange regional workshops which will discuss the findings of its broad "Nineteen Campus Study." Researchers at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology are using computers to develop better management and educational environment models (28). Data have been collected from fourteen colleges and universities, and the participating institutions are expected to benefit from learning about themselves as well as about other participating schools. Other practical approaches include the sponsorship of administration internships (1) and the publication of handbooks (5, 15, 21).

Members of the academic community also need legal aid to deal with the problems raised by current demands for student rights and various methods of protest. Several items in the compendium illustrate how these problems are being handled. Both the American Bar Association (ABA) and The American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) stress the need to give students their right to freedom of speech. The difficulty for administrators lies in drawing the lines between legitimate dissent and disruption. The ABA (32) has developed guidelines concerning protection of freedom of expression, disciplinary procedures, and the university's relationship to civil authority. It suggests that administrators follow these guidelines to allow for "valid student dissent. . . while preserving ordinary educational processes." The ACLU statement (2) is much broader in scope; it does not simply discuss legal procedures, but emphasizes the position of the student as citizen of the community with all the rights and responsibilities he has in that context.

The overwhelming majority of items in the compendium are concerned with general rather than institutional studies. In either case, the findings should be valuable to a wide range of colleges and universities.

COMPENDIUM

General Studies

1. The Academic Administration Internship Program. Begun 1965-Continuing. Charles G. Dobbins, Director, The American Council on Education, 1 Dupont Circle, Washington, DC 20036.

   This program is designed to encourage and support faculty and staff members interested in academic administration. Forty nine are interns this year. ACE chooses interns from its member institutions, and they serve in an administrative capacity at their own school or another institution. Participants meet for week-long fall and spring seminars; regional meetings are also projected for the 1970-1 program. Each participant writes an end-of-the-year paper on a subject of his own choosing. Although these reports are for in-house use, some are made available through ACE publications.

2. "Academic Freedom and Civil Liberties of Students in Colleges and Universities." Begun June 1969-Pamphlet forthcoming. American Civil Liberties Union. Department of Information and Education, 156 Fifth Avenue, New York, NY 10010.

   This revision of the 1956 ACLU statement will include several sections which touch on the issue of governance: "The Student as a Member of the Community of Scholars"; "The Student's Role in the Formulation of Academic Policy"; "Extracurricular Activities"; "Personal Freedom"; and "Regulations and Disciplinary Procedures."

3. Administrative Perspectives in the Large University. Begun 1968-Scheduled completion 1970. Terry Lunsford, Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, 1947 Center Street, Berkeley, California 94704. Sponsored by US Office of Education.

   This study deals with the attitudes of executives in large and prestigious American universities concerning issues of administrative authority on the campus. The investigator uses a "theoretical framework based on Max Weber's conception of authority as positional power variably legitimated by shared beliefs." He analyzed 526 replies for "[executives'] views of authority, administration job-groups and characteristics of educational background, career involvements, age, and political/religious preferences." The study was supplemented with interviews and observations of administrative councils in operation. "Analysis suggests features of modern university administrators' situation that elicit their characteristic perspective and its variations, and outlines possible implications for future administration as a part of university government."

4. The Assembly on University Goals and Governance. Begun September 1969-Scheduled completion September 1971. Martin Myerson, Stephen R. Graubard, and Robert M. O'Neil, 7 Linden Street, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138. Sponsored by American Academy of Arts and Sciences, Ford Foundation, Rockefeller Foundation, and Stern Family Fund.

The Assembly will discuss, develop and help to implement alternative ways of dealing with the issues of university goals and governance. In the first year, the Assembly intends to generate new ideas; in the second year, to disseminate them. The Assembly's structure consists of: (1) a Secretariat, located in Buffalo and Boston; (2) a Panel of Academy Advisers; and (3) five autonomous Policy Councils which, in the first year, will deal with "Learning, Teaching and Evaluation," "Research and Service," "Access, Scale and Quality," "Relations with Other Institutions," and "Models of Governance." These Councils are said to represent five points of view rather than five topics. During the year, they will make working papers available to other members of the Assembly. Also scheduled for the first year are Cambridge seminars directed by Talcott Parsons, and a projected student conference in San Francisco in mid-February. The Arthur D. Little Company will prepare a bibliography and conduct field research. At the end of this first year, the Chairman and the Policy Councils will publish reports containing data, a delineation of feasible policy options, and a set of specific suggestions.

In the Assembly's second year, forums and seminars will be held across the country to review the work of the first year. Through these meetings, the Assembly hopes to improve the level of discussion on questions of governance and goals. These discussions will involve hundreds of people within and outside the university community.

5. Campus Governance Program of the American Association for Higher Education. Begun July 1966-Scheduled completion Fall 1970. Morris Keeton, Harold Hodgkinson, and Stephen Plumer, Antioch Columbia, P.O. Box 877, Columbia, Maryland 21043. Partially sponsored by Kettering Foundation.

The Program was designed to help colleges and universities improve their internal communications and governance. There are two stages: Phase I, now nearing completion, involves a program of research, conferences and publications. For Phase II, tentative plans are being made for regional workshops in which members of the university community would meet to learn about the Program's findings, discuss university problems, and get advice from consultants who would be available to all higher education institutions in the area.

The first stage of the program involved three separate projects. One, concerned with faculty-administration relationships, resulted in the AAHE brochure, Faculty Participation in Academic Governance. The second resulted in Morton A. Rauh's The Trusteeships of Colleges and Universities. The third resulted in the Nineteen Campus Study, soon to be published. This book will include data from questionnaires, on-campus interviews, editorial and theoretical papers, and other information.

6. Campus Tensions: Analysis and Recommendations. Report of the Special Committee on Campus Tensions (Washington, DC: American Council on Education, 1970).

This report of the Special Committee on Campus Tensions was developed from the findings of a questionnaire, commissioned papers, meetings, case studies, and interviews. The report discusses how different constituent groups of the campus community—students, faculty, administrators, and trustees—perceive the problems of higher education. Concerning

governance, the Committee suggests that effective communication between the constituent groups promises sound and widely accepted decisions. To achieve this goal, it recommends that: (1) the processes of academic governance should be seen as "fair" by all academic groups; (2) methods of communication—rumor centers, centralized files, ombudsmen—must be established; (3) joint administrative-faculty-student committees should be established, whenever possible, to promote effective decision making; (4) all members of the academic community should have a "shared commitment. . .to the principle of institutional self-governance" and its accompanying responsibilities.

7. Campus Unrest. Begun December 1968-Scheduled completion November 1971. Alexander W. Astin, Alan E. Bayer, and Robert F. Boruch, Office of Research, American Council on Education, 1 Dupont Circle, Washington, DC 20036. Sponsored by National Institutes of Mental Health.

   This study "will attempt to identify" specific causes of unrest and their relationship to the total character of individual institutions. Two of the questions concerned with governance are: "Do administrative practices play an important role, or are protests more or less inevitable given a particular type of student clientele?" and What is the relationship between the development of a demonstration and the administrative response? In conducting this study, the researchers will: (1) review the literature; (2) define "student unrest"; (3) use two units of analysis—the student and the institution; (4) gather empirical data from a representative sample of the 300 institutions in the ACE's Cooperative Institutional Research Program; and (5) undertake "intensive" case studies of about 30 colleges and universities in the Cooperative Program.

8. Change in the Four-Year College. Begun September 1969-Scheduled completion June 1970. Michael R. Harris, Director, Institute in Higher Education, Claremont Graduate School, Claremont, California 91711. Sponsored by US Office of Education.

   Forty college administrators and faculty members from four-year colleges are studying existing and proposed forms of college and university governance. Their activities include independent reading and talks with college administrators and experts in organizational theory. Although there are no reports planned for publication now, some may be written at a later time.

9. Changes in Patterns of Internal Authority and Influence in the Governance of Higher Education. Begun September 1969-No completion date given. T.R. McConnell, The Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, 1947 Center Street, Berkeley, California 94704. Sponsored by US Office of Education.

   This study will examine changes in governance patterns in Great Britain: the relationship of faculty members to governing boards and the nature of student participation. Recommendations resulting from the project will be directed toward American colleges and universities.

10. The Colleges and the Courts, 1966-1970. Begun January 1968-Scheduled completion January 1971. M.M. Chambers, Department of Educational Administrators, Illinois State University, Normal, Illinois 61761.

This study is a continuation of six earlier volumes under the same title. It deals with cases tried in federal courts and supreme and appellate courts across the country.

11. "Comparative Study of Aims and Administration in Higher Education." Begun March 1966-Available. Troy Duster, The Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, 1947 Center Street, Berkeley, California 94704. Sponsored by US Office of Education.

In this study of Swedish and American university structures, the researcher investigates the relationship between a university's declared aims and the structures which serve them. He discusses the effects of certain pressures on American university structures.

12. The Confidence Crisis (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1970). Paul L. Dressel, F. Craig Johnson, and Philip Marcus.

This study's purposes are: (1) "To clarify problems and operations of the university departments and describe differences in approaches characteristic of disciplines and universities," and (2) "To arrive at conclusions from which suggestions for improvement can be derived."

13. Constructive Changes to Ease Campus Tensions. Published January 1970. Office of Institutional Research, National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, 1 Dupont Circle, Washington, DC 20036.

This study surveys governance changes at 90% of the Association's member institutions. The changes are divided into two broad areas and listed by state. The areas are: (1) Student Participation in University Policy-Making, which includes such categories as institution-wide committees, boards of trustees and planning; and (2) Policies and Procedures on Conduct and Disruption, which includes codes, police policy, firearms, discipline, etc.

14. Course to Train Educational Administrators. Begins July 14, 1970-Scheduled Completion July 25, 1970. John Dearden, Institute for Educational Management, Holyoke Center, 1350 Massachusetts Avenue, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138. Sponsored by the Sloan Foundation.

This course will train about 60 educational administrators in the techniques used in corporate business. Harvard faculty will instruct in four major areas: (1) Managing the Educational Institution; (2) Information Systems for Planning and Control; (3) The Raising and Management of Funds; and (4) Human Behavior and Organizational Problems.

15. Duties and Responsibilities of College and University Trustees (Raleigh, NC: North Carolina Board of Education, 1969). Ben C. Fisher, North Carolina Board of Higher Education, 1307 Glenwood Avenue, P.O. Box 10887, Raleigh, North Carolina 27605.

The issues this manual discusses concern trustees everywhere. Chapters deal with: (1) the expanding role of the trustees in higher education; (2) major responsibilities of trusteeship; (3) the trustee and the faculty; (4) the trustee and the student; (5) the trustee and the administration; and (6) the trustee of public colleges and universities. Appendices include statements and studies regarding governance in North Carolina as well as basic policy documents, such as the 1940 AAUP statement on academic freedom.

16. Education in Arts and Sciences. Begun June 1969-Scheduled completion October 1971. Richard J. Storr, Professor of History, Faculty of Arts and Sciences, York University, Downsview, Toronto, Canada. Sponsored by the Carnegie Commission on the Future of Higher Education.

This study will identify the options of universities as they plan graduate education in the arts and sciences for the rest of this century. One set of options is concerned with governance. The investigator will examine the historical development of certain large issues. Four periods will be considered: (1) a period of frustrated efforts to found graduate education; (2) the emergence and establishment of the American university as distinct from the college; (3) the consolidation and amplification of standards, organizations, etc.; (4) the current period of criticism and reform.

17. The Effect of Data Revealing How Students, Faculty and Administration Perceive Their Roles in University Policy and Decision Making and the Climate for Decision Making in Private and Public Colleges in the Western Part of New York State. Begun February 1969-Scheduled completion December 1970. Charles Welch, Dean of Students, Rochester Institute of Technology, 1 Lomb Memorial Drive, Rochester, New York 14614. Sponsored by New York State Division of Higher Education.

This dissertation examines the extent of agreement among different sections of the academic community regarding their perception of their appropriate roles in university policy and decision making and the values supportive of these roles. The researcher uses the Troyer Inventory, which provides responses on a five point scale, from complete student autonomy to complete faculty-administration autonomy. A minimum of 80% response from any one constituency in any institution was obtained from a controlled sampling of students, faculty, and administration in five western New York State colleges and universities.

18. "Faculty Participation in College and University Government." Begun December 1969-Scheduled completion April 1970. William B. Woolf, American Association of University Professors, 1 Dupont Circle, Washington, DC 20036.

This study will "develop standards for evaluation of faculty participation in institutional government." A questionnaire has been sent to all 1024 AAUP chapters and to administrators of institutions which have chapters. The questionnaire is based on the principles of the AAUP's 1966 Statement of the Government of Colleges and Universities. Administrators and chapters will file separate questionnaires, unless total agreement about questionnaire answers warrants a joint report. Results will be reported at the AAUP annual meeting in April 1970.

19. Governance of Multicampus Universities. Begun October 1967-Scheduled publication Fall 1970 (New York: McGraw-Hill). Eugene C. Lee and Frank M. Bowen, Institute of Governmental Studies, University of California, Berkeley, California 94720. Sponsored by Carnegie Commission on the Future of Higher Education.

    The researchers define a multicampus university as "the existence under a single governing board and chief executive of two or more campuses, each with its own chief executive." The study concerns nine public systems which do not include all institutions of public higher education in their states. Researchers examined: (1) organizational patterns and the distribution of formal and informal authority within the system; (2) the special problems and relationships of students, faculty, alumni, etc.; and (3) the impact on these various elements of the external administrative and political environment. The increasing role of the federal government in higher education and its impact on organizational and administrative structure is also under consideration. The study is based on a review of documents and interviews with administrators and faculty participants in governance.

20. Governing the Restless Campus. Report of a Legislative Work Conference on Higher Education (Boulder, Colorado: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, February 1970). Robert H. Kroepsch and Dorothy P. Buck, editors.

    This is a report of the proceedings of the Commission's sixth legislative work conference. Sections pertaining directly to governance are: (1) "Campus Unrest and Campus Reform"; (2) "Legal Implications of Campus Unrest"; and (3) "Who Should Be in Charge of the Restless Campus? Why?"

21. Handbook on University Government. Begun July 1968-Scheduled completion Spring 1970. Henry L. Mason and Louis Joughin, Department of Political Science, Tulane University, New Orleans, Louisiana 70118 and American Association of University Professors, 1 Dupont Circle, Washington, DC 20036. Sponsored by Esso Foundation.

    The investigators are expanding their "Model Senates" study into a Handbook. The Handbook will be divided into three chapters: (1) "Principles of College and University Government—A Guide Through Some Recent Literature"; (2) "Provisions for College and University Government—A Guide Through Some Recent Constitutional Documents"; and (3) "Suggested Constitutional Provisions." The authors reviewed the literature on university government and sampled 100 constitutional documents.

22. Independent Liberal Arts Colleges. Begun September 1968-Scheduled publication Fall 1970 (New York: McGraw-Hill). Morris Keeton, Antioch College, P.O. Box 877, Columbia, Maryland 21043. Sponsored by Carnegie Commission on the Future of Higher Education.

This study describes private, independent, and non-Catholic church-related colleges committed primarily to BA programs; it also makes recommendations about the future functions and finances of such colleges. The investigator used US Office of Education, National Opinion Research Center, American Council on Education and other statistical studies. He used information from both the "Study of the Future of the Liberal Arts College" (published in Struggle and Promise, McGraw-Hill, 1969) and the AAHE Campus Governance Program. He also sent a questionnaire to and conduct a document study of 100 private independent colleges and visited 15 campuses.

23. The Innovative Spirit: Change in Higher Education. Begun June 1969-Scheduled publication June 1970. (San Francisco, California: Jossey-Bass) Algo D. Henderson, Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, 1947 Center Street, Berkeley, California 94720.

About one-half of this book is devoted to organization and governance. It includes an analysis of current innovations and proposals for changes in educational objectives, curricula, and organizational patterns.

24. Institutional Planning and Organizational Self-Renewal. Begun September 1966-Available May 1970. Ernest G. Palola, Center for Research and Development in Higher Education. 1947 Center Street, Berkeley, California 94704. Sponsored by US Office of Education.

This study seeks to answer two questions: (1) What kinds of institutional planning is being done by various types of institutions? (2) What substantive changes have been effected as a direct result of continuous planning? The researcher has analyzed documents and interviewed participants in planning at 80 public and private colleges and universities.

25. Institutions in Transition. Begun March 1968-Report available Fall 1970. Harold Hodgkinson, Carnegie Commission on the Future of Higher Education, 1947 Center Street, Berkeley, California 94704.

This study focuses on changes in American higher education that have important consequences for the future of colleges and universities. The project has been divided into two phases. In Phase I, a statistical report on educational change was prepared using the US Office of Education directories from 1941 to the present as basic data. In analyzing the data, changes were noted in: type of control, level of degree offered, type of program, percentage of male and female enrollments, and the listings of institutions that were added, dropped, or merged. In addition to this analysis, there were questionnaire returns from 1230 higher education institutions in America. These forms asked for information on institutional movement from one category to another; changes which have taken place; personal evaluation of the importance of these changes, and the president's description of the changes he considers most important, their history and consequences. The questionnaire

also asked the president to predict the major changes which his institution may encounter in the next five to ten years.

Phase II is concerned with five case studies of institutional changes, which will include discussions of changing patterns of governance. The areas of change to be examined are based on the questionnaire findings. The institutions chosen for case study underwent changes two or three years ago, so the consequences are fairly well developed and the memory of the experience is reasonably clear. They include: (1) a private university that has become a public institution; (2) a local junior college that now awards BA degrees and has attempted to establish a broader base; (3) an urban university; (4) a land-grant college with aspirations for greatness. Compensatory programs are also being examined.

26. "Leadership Behavior of Department Chairmen in Selected State Institutions of Higher Education." Available Spring 1970. Glenn B. Schroeder, Department of Educational Administration, Temple University, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19122.

"The Getzels and Guba social systems model was used to develop hypotheses for obtaining knowledge concerning: (1) the 'real' leadership behavior of chairmen as described by themselves and faculty; (2) the 'ideal' leadership behavior as described by deans, chairmen, and faculty; and (3) responsibility, authority, and delegation behaviors reported by deans and chairmen." Information was collected from 331 respondents in 17 state institutions. Some of the conclusions are: (1) the chairmen are in a "conflict position" because the deans' demand for increased leadership is not as great as the faculty's; (2) "Responsibility, Authority, and Delegation are functions of institutional size"; and (3) the quadrant analysis technique is a viable method.

27. The Liberal Arts Colleges in the University. Begun October 1968-Scheduled completion June 1971. Charles Bidwell, Department of Education, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 60637. Sponsored by the Carnegie Commission on the Future of Higher Education.

This report will provide an overview of the development and current status of the government, organization, and members of the liberal arts colleges of American universities. The author is reviewing published statistical sources, internal documents, and questionnaires, and is conducting interviews. His study will mainly rely on survey analysis and case studies.

28. Management of University Education Research Project. Begun November 1968-No completion date given. Arnold E. Amstutz, Katherine Moore and Tom Riesing, The Sloan School of Management, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139. Sponsored by Carnegie and Ford Foundations.

The researchers are developing a behavioral model of the educational process at the university level in order to improve institutional management and the educational environment. In the first phase of the project, the researchers developed a computer software system that processes the raw data from the 14 schools under study and allows for the selection of specific populations for analysis. Now in the second phase, the researchers

are using this sytem to develop alternatives to the environments under study and construct models of educational environments. Since the system is interactive, each school is expected to benefit both from its own experiences and those of the other participants. Since the system is interactive, each school is expected to benefit both from its own experiences and those of the other participants.

29. "The Nature and Extent of Student Government Participation in University Decision Making on Campuses Experiencing Degrees of Organized Protest." Begun January 1969-Scheduled completion August 1970. Eldridge W. Roark, Assistant Dean of Men, Purdue University, Lafayette, Indiana 47907.

    This dissertation examines the relationship between the nature and extent of student involvement in university policy making and the extent, frequency, and intensity of protest. A questionnaire was used to gather data from an administrator and a student government representative in a sampling of 100 US compuses.

30. "Policy Boards and Policy Making in United States Higher Education." Begun September 1967-Substantially completed; some analyses continuing. August W. Eberle, Department of Higher Education, School of Education, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana 47401.

    This project aims to: (1) collect basic data concerning policy board membership, operation, etc. for all higher education institutions in the US; and (2) use this knowledge to develop principles of organization, membership, and operation of boards. A questionnaire was sent to the presidents of all 2221 institutions of higher education (accounting for 1935 boards); 1769 responses (1490 boards) were returned. Six doctoral dissertations, five already completed, were developed from this study.

31. Project 20: Appropriate Structures, Participants, and Processes for Program Development. Begun February 1970-Scheduled completion February 1975. Lyman Glenny, The Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, 1947 Center Street, Berkeley, California 94704. Sponsored by US Office of Education.

    Project 20 will focus on "the organization, structure, and process for governance of colleges and universities." Project 20 includes nine individual research projects which will develop a full understanding of governance—internal problems, external influences, and the relationship between the two. These projects will concentrate on different aspects of governance questions and will seek to develop models and guidelines. Research data, except for projects begun in 1969, will be drawn from institutions in 12 states, which have already been closely examined by the Center's staff. Additional studies will be forthcoming. Three of the projects deal directly with college and university governance.

    Changes in Patterns of Internal Authority and Influence in the Governance of Higher Education. T.R. McConnell. July 1969-July 1970.

Through an examination of recent findings on governance, the researcher will analyze emerging patterns of governance and indicate new research problems. Papers and/or a monograph will result.

Student Participation in Academic Governance. Troy Duster and Terry Lunsford. July 1969-February 1971.

This study will examine experiments in student participation in governance, describing and explaining all aspects of their development. Three to six case studies will be conducted at diverse institutions; structured personal interviews will be emphasized. The series of reports which will result will provide bases for policy guidelines.

Trustee Decision Making. J.G. Paltridge. July 1970-July 1971.

This study will analyze all aspects of the trustee's decision-making role, and his success as a buffer against outside intervention. Case studies will be developed of four public four-year colleges and universities through questionnaires, site visits, interviews, and a review of pertinent documents. This study should present a general picture of the governing board's effectiveness and its role in the life of the university.

32. "Report of the American Bar Association Commission on Campus Government and Student Dissent." Begun August 1969-Report available April 1970. American Bar Foundation, 1155 East 60th Street, Chicago, Illinois 60637.

This commission—composed of practicing lawyers, higher education leaders, and behavioral scientists—has drafted legal standards and procedural guidelines for campus administrators. The purpose of these guidelines is "to accommodate valid student dissent and facilitate student participation in campus affairs while preserving ordinary educational processes." The report makes general recommendations in two sections: "The Protection of Freedom of Expression" and "The Maintenance of Order With Justice."

The commission may continue its work with an examination of student participation in campus government.

33. "A Report on the Status, Cause, and Future of Student Unrest on American College and University Campuses." Available January 1970. Joseph R. Ellis and Michael L. Thompson, Department of Education, Northern Illinois University, Dekalb, Illinois 60116.

To provide understanding of the causes of student unrest so that "workable solutions" may be developed, the researchers conducted a statistical survey of unrest at 612 randomly selected, accredited four-year institutions of higher education. Student unrest is "characterized by feelings of dissatisfaction based on a perception of the status and trends of contemporary society as expressed by acts of dissent." Questionnaires were sent to a student affairs administrator, a student leader, and a faculty member at each institution; 983 completed questionnaires were returned. Governance was listed as a major cause of unrest, and the researchers suggest, among other things, "a comprehensive self-evaluation" and "an organization for decision-making" which is democratic.

34. "Status of Opinions of Teaching Faculty in Higher Education." Publication Summer 1970. Glen Robinson, Research Division, National Education Association, 1201 16th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20036.

This study will sample faculty opinions about governance and the faculty's role in governance.

35. "Student Government and Student Participation in Junior College Governance—Models for the 1970's." Available January 1970. William L. Deegan, California Junior College Association, 1020 Twelfth Street, Sacramento, California 95814.

This paper examines "models for student participation in governance, rather than merely focusing on student government as a separate entity." The discussion applies to four year colleges as well as junior colleges. The structures include: the traditional model ("Student Government as an Educational Experience") which the author considers "paternalistic" and ineffective; the separate jurisdictions model, which he calls "unwise and unworkable"; several participatory models, which he believes are the best way for students to get involved in governance. While noting their weaknesses, he urges experimentation with these models.

36. Student Participation in Academic Governance (Tentative Title). Begun February 1970-Scheduled completion August 1970. R. Neil Reynolds and E.F. Schietinger, Southern Regional Education Board, 130 Sixth Street, N.W., Atlanta, Georgia 30313.

The researchers will examine the pros and cons of student participation in academic governance, as seen by various higher education constituencies; provide historical prospective on the issue; and study the viability of several working models. They will concentrate on developments in the states in the SREB region, but will also give limited attention to student participation in other states.

37. Student Participation in Academic Governance. Published February 1970. Lora H. Robinson and Janet D. Shoenfeld, ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education, 1 Dupont Circle, Suite 630, Washington, DC 20036.

This booklet includes a review, an annotated bibliography of the literature concerning student participation in academic governance, and a compendium of recent institutional changes which have increased student participation in governance.

38. Student-Related Matters in the College Units of a Complex University. Begun September 1968-Scheduled completion July 1970. Jerald Hunt, Director of Continuing Education, Millikin University, Decatur, Illinois 62522.

This study will examine certain student-related matters as they are handled in nine undergraduate schools or colleges of a complex university. The investigator suggests that these schools, "as semi-autonomous units . . . have developed their own patterns of

governance" in student affairs. Thirty eight administrators involved in student affairs, on the college and university levels, answered "systematic interview questions."

39. "A Study of the Practice of Procedural Due Process in Actions of Dismissal in Indiana Colleges and Universities." Begun Fall 1968-Scheduled completion Spring 1970. Norman V. Bridges, Dean of Students, Bethel College, Mishawaka, Indiana 46544.

    The author has analyzed development of the law dealing with the dismissal of students from colleges and universities, and developed a framework with which to measure the current practice of due process. Through interviews, he has established what current practice is, and he suggests guidelines for the future.

40. Thoughts on University Government. Kingman Brewster, Jr., Yale University, New Haven, Connecticut 06520.

    This pamphlet contains two essays. The first, "How Yale Should Be Governed," was part of the President's report for 1967-68, which appeared in October, 1968. In it, President Brewster discusses his understanding of the roles of faculty, students, trustees, and administration at Yale. He concludes with suggested "Guidelines for Yale's Governance," of which the underlying principle is that all members of the community should participate in university life in a way that furthers Yale's goals and interests.

    The second essay, "The Politics of Academia," was an address delivered to the Yale Political Union in September, 1969. In this speech, President Brewster proposed the doctrine of administrative "accountability" as the basis of Yale's governance rather than representation. Under a system of accountability, there are three requirements: (1) "disclosure" of current activities and decisions; (2) "right of petition by those affected by decisions"; and (3) "some regular, understood process" of evaluating the administration. Brewster argues that this system would be effective because it recognizes the unwillingness of members of the university community to govern themselves, and the fact that students would rather not be governed by their peers. Furthermore, it would allow administrators to act quickly when necessary.

41. University as an Organization. Begun February 1970-Scheduled completion July 1971. James A. Perkins, Center for Educational Enquiry, 1180 Avenue of the Americas, New York, New York 10036. Sponsored by Carnegie Commission on the Future of Higher Education.

    This study will provide an analysis of the university's evolvement as an organization. It will compare the university's distinctive features to other institutions and study national and international variations in its development. The author will also examine "policy implications and possibilities for reform in organization."

Institutional Studies

42. The Ad Hoc Committee on Campus Governance. Begun January 1969-Continuing. George Allan, Department of Philosophy, Dickinson College, Carlisle, Pennsylvania 17013.

The original proposal of this faculty-student committee for a cabinet system of government including faculty and student houses was rejected. The proposal now being considered calls for a system of joint faculty-student legislative and advisory committees. The legislative committees would deal with: the academic program; student affairs; admissions and financial aid; academic standards. The advisory committees would cover: institutional priorities and resources; and development and communications.

43. Ad Hoc Committee on University Governance. September 1969-Continuing. Ferrel Heady, The University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, New Mexico 87106.

The Regents of the University of New Mexico established this Committee to examine the University's governance and make recommendations on "[formulating] principles of University governance." The Committee is made up of all segments of the university community.

44. "Address to the Eighth Annual Faculty Convocation." November 6, 1969. Homer D. Babbidge, Jr., President, University of Connecticut, Storrs, Connecticut 06268.

President Babbidge sees two basic causes of problems in state university governance: (1) The university per se is dependent upon the state, and it must recognize the public's interest in its activities. (2) There is no University constitution with clearly stated purposes, roles, and procedures. This lack of definition results in continuing debate over the correctness of various activities. To improve governance, he proposes that a University constitution be written, approved by the people of the state and incorporated as an article in the state constitution. The board of trustees would then act as "supreme court," ruling on the constitutionality of the University's actions. Citizens of the state, as well as members of the University, might question the University's activities. This system, President Babbidge suggests, would bring the University closer to the goals of "a high degree of self-determination," and "as free an atmosphere as possible in which to live and work." The proposal is now under consideration.

45. Case Studies in University Governance. Begun September 1969-Scheduled completion September 1970. David Dill and NASULGC Committee, 4071 Administration Building, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48104. Sponsored by National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges.

This study will provide an account of the experiences of various institutions which have, in the past two years, experimented with new forms of university governance. The researcher will conduct on-site interviews at participating institutions.

Another part of the study, Participation and Control in Decision Making: A Case Study of Three University Senates, was begun in November 1969 and will be completed in Summer 1971. In this project, the researcher will apply the variables of an organizational model—control, involvement, conflict, and positive member attitudes—to three university senates. Individuals will be interviewed, relevant documents investigated, and a questionnaire administered to members of each university senate.

46. Chancellor's Panel on University Purposes. Begun January 1970-Continuing. John S. Toll, State University of New York, Thurlow Terrace, Albany, New York 12201. Partially sponsored by SUNY Research Foundation.

This Panel will study SUNY's goals—their rationale and the methods used to achieve them. It will recommend guidelines for future growth. The Panel will have 50 members drawn from the public and the academic sectors. It is to be a continuing body headed by presidents in the SUNY system who alternate their one-year terms. A small staff of faculty on leave and students on fellowships will prepare position papers.

47. Commission on Governance of The George Washington University. Begun January 1970-Continuing Body. James Mitchell, Rice Hall-8th Floor, The George Washington University, Washington, DC 20006.

This Commission is examining "responsibility, authority, and decision making" at George Washington University, and will make recommendations for changes in governance practices. The Commission is composed of students, faculty, alumni, trustees and other interested groups. To understand how formal and informal governance procedures work at George Washington, the Commission will examine documents, conduct interviews, and solicit written statements from the academic community. After this information has been collected, the Commission will make plans for further action.

48. Consultative Forum. Begun February 1970-Continuing. J.R. Gaskin, Chairman, Steering Committee, South Building, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, North Carolina 27514.

The Forum includes representatives from all sections of the University community. In its first post-organizational meeting in March, it discussed ways of arriving at an accommodation of races in society and in the University. The next meeting is scheduled for April. The Forum is consultative only. State action would be required to expand its powers to the formulation of legislation.

49. Cornell Constituent Assembly. Summer Research Reports (Ithaca, New York: Cornell University, 1969). Paul P. Van Riper, Willard Straight Hall, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York 14850.

The Cornell University Constituent Assembly has representatives from all sections of the campus community. Of the eleven committee reports contained in this volume, two deal directly with governance. "Crises and Change in Governance of Cornell and Other Universities" identifies factors contributing to a governance crisis at Cornell, and examines other universities that have faced this problem. The report asserts that lack of participation in decision making, poor communication and Cornell's hierarchical structure are some of the factors contributing to the crisis at Cornell, and suggests creation of "a single community-wide governing body" to help solve Cornell's problems.

"The Regulation of Conduct" discusses Cornell's student conduct system and examines a wide variety of alternative systems. It does not recommend a new judicial structure, but concludes that the effectiveness of the system is determined as much by the national atmosphere as by the system itself.

50. Evaluating the Climate of Academic Decision-Making: An Institutional Case Study. Begun September 1968-Scheduled completion December 1970. Ronald L. Gaudreau, City University Construction Fund, 32 West 42nd Street, New York, New York 10036.

This dissertation will examine and compare how students, faculty, administrators, and trustees perceive their roles in university policy and decision making at a single institution. The researcher is using an abbreviated form of the Troyer Inventory and will report the data back to the institution under study. He will conduct a follow-up sampling to discover any possible effects of the data in clearing up misconceptions of roles.

51. Faculty Participation in Academic Governance at the University of Minnesota. Available Fall 1970. William L. Deegan and Kenneth P. Mortimer, California Junior College Association, 1020 Twelfth Street, Sacramento, California 95814.

This study covers faculty participation in personnel and budgetary affairs, curriculum development, and educational policy. It also includes sections on faculty-administrative relationships, the degree of centralization and decentralization in decision making, and structural characteristics of faculty senates.

52. "Final Report from the Ad Hoc Committee on Channels of Communication Between Administration and Faculty." Available November 1969. Paul C. Simms, Department of Physics, Purdue University, Lafayette, Indiana 47907.

The University Senate established this committee "to further the harmonious working relationship between administration and faculty." The specific suggestions for University Senate reform are based upon the belief that the faculty plays a central role in university governance and that this role is necessary because it insures respect for the faculty's academic freedom and professional performance. The reforms recommended are directed toward improving communication. Some suggestions are: establish an elective position of Chairman of the University Senate to serve as a faculty spokesman, especially in crises; develop new procedures for ensuring implementation of recommendations; encourage administrative participation in Senate meetings; and increase trustee-faculty consultations.

53. The Governing of Princeton University. Final Report of the Special Committee on the Structure of the University (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University, 1970).

This report reviews and recommends broad changes in the governance of Princeton University. Some recommendations of the student-faculty Special Committee set up in May 1968 include: (1) a 57-member Council of the Princeton University Community to "consider and investigate any question of University policy. . .[governance]. .and any general issue related to the welfare of the University"; (2) extension of student government responsibility to all areas of undergraduate life; and (3) establishment of a position of University Ombudsman. The Council has been established.

54. Interim Report: The Board of Trustees. Duke University Commission on Governance (Durham, North Carolina: Duke University, 1970). William W. Van Alstyne, Duke University.

The Commission includes representatives from all sections of the academic community. In preparing their study, the members surveyed 24 governance studies. Their report contains: (1) a description of the Board of Trustees; (2) alternative trustee arrangements; (3) recommendations respecting composition of the Board; (4) a study of the Board and the University community; (5) a summary of analysis and recommendations. Although the report deals with Duke's situation, some general observations are made.

55. The Morgan Years at Antioch College: A Study of the Processes of Curricular Innovation and Organizational Change. Begun August 1969-No completion date given. William Lombus, 15 Locust Street, Florence, Kentucky 41042.

This doctoral dissertation will examine the process of organizational change involved in restructuring Antioch College's curriculum during 1920-1933. The author will conduct interviews, survey the documents, and present an analysis and description within a social-psychological framework.

56. Presidential Advisory Council. Task Force on Governance. Continuing. Rae O. Weimer, Office of the President, University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida 32601.

The Council continues last year's Action Conference, which directly and indirectly initiated changes in the governance structures of the University. These changes generally involved the inclusion of students on University committees which deal with student-related affairs, and the addition of faculty to the Administrative Council. The Constitution Committee is now developing a proposal for changes in the Senate.

57. "Provisions for On-Campus Governance." Adopted Spring 1970-Effective Fall 1970. Colgate University, Hamilton, New York 13346.

Student and faculty committees have agreed upon new governance structures which include: (1) A University Council composed of faculty, students, and administrators. This group will have "responsibility for all matters of policy regarding the operation of the University consistent with the By-Laws of the Board of Trustees except those matters specifically reserved. . .to the Faculty. . .and the Student Senate." (2) Seven policy commissions, comprising faculty, students and administrators, to deal with different aspects of academic life and policy. These commissions will report to the Council. In addition, the faculty will meet regularly and hear reports from its committees, and the students will hold Senate meetings.

The committees also recommended that student and faculty participation on committees of the Board of Trustees be discontinued, except for the nominating and religious life committees.

58. "Report of the Task Force on Student Participation in Campus Governance." Available December 1969. Mark Ferber, Secretary to the Task Force, University Hall, University of California, Berkeley, California 94720.

This report to the California legislature outlines in broad terms the role students should play in governance on the different campuses of the state university. The report upholds three "major guidelines." (1) Student leadership should dominate in matters concerning student life on campus, with participation of administration and faculty. (2) Faculty leadership should dominate in the area of academic decision making, with student and administration involvement. (3) In areas where the administration must take the lead, the roles of students and faculty have to be carefully considered. Recommendations are made which discuss: student involvement in decision making on departmental, college and school, and campus-wide administrative levels; the role of the Academic Senate; greater effectiveness of student government; and the need for a mechanism to facilitate campus-wide communication. The mode of implementation is left to the individual campuses.

59. Special Committee of the Trustees: Interim Reports. Begun May 1968-Continuing. Stuart M. Glass, Executive Director, 402 Low Memorial Library, Columbia University, New York, New York 10027. Partially sponsored by Robert Earl McConnell Foundation.

Second Interim Report of the Special Committee of the Trustees of Columbia University. ED 029 586. MF-$0.25, HC-$0.45. Third Interim Report of the Special Committee of the Trustees; Statutes, Chapter II, The University Senate. ED 028 751. MF-$0.25, HC-$0.95.

The committee's purpose is "to study and recommend changes in the basic structure of the university." It has met regularly with representatives from all factions of the Columbia community. Four interim reports have been issued. The first, which appeared in September 1968, discusses guiding principles and the restructuring problems under consideration. The second and third reports, issued in March and May 1969, deal with ways to involve faculty and students in governance—specifically the creation of a University Senate. The fourth report, issued in November 1969, makes recommendations concerning the Board of Trustees and its role. The fifth report will deal with the reorganization of the central administration.

60. Task Force on Goals and Priorities. Begun September 1969-Scheduled completion May 1970. William Holmes, Cutler Hall, Ohio University, Athens, Ohio 45701.

This task force is reassessing the goals and priorities of the University and will propose governance structures to implement its findings.

61. University-wide Committee on Governance. Begun September 1969-Continuing. John T. Dunlop, Chairman, Wadsworth House, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138.

This is a 34-member committee of students, faculty, and administration established to "identify the most important [issues] and recommend optimum structures and methods for considering them." The Committee has been broken down into three sub-committees whose topics are (tentatively): (1) "The University: Challenges and Opportunities"; (2) "Financial Constraints and Governance," and "The Central University Administration"; and (3) "Inter-School Relations," and "Specific Procedures for Particular Problems." The latter includes discipline, faculty benefits, community relations, research policy, etc. No reports are available at this time.

INDEXES

Authors

Allan, George, 16
Amstutz, Arnold E., 12
Astin, Alexander W., 7
Babbidge, Homer D., Jr., 17
Bayer, Alan E., 7
Bidwell, Charles, 12
Boruch, Robert F., 7
Bowen, Frank M., 10
Brewster, Kingman, Jr., 16
Bridges, Norman V., 16
Buck, Dorothy P., 10
Chambers, M.M., 8
Dearden, John, 8
Deegan, William L., 15, 19
Dill, David, 17
Dobbins, Charles G., 5
Dressel, Paul L., 8
Dunlop, John T., 21
Duster, Troy, 8, 14
Eberle, August W., 13
Ellis, Joseph R., 14
Ferber, Mark, 20
Fisher, Ben C., 9
Gaskin, J.R., 18
Gaudreau, Ronald L., 19
Glass, Stuart M., 21
Glenny, Lyman, 13
Graubard, Stephen R., 5
Harris, Michael R., 7
Heady, Ferrel, 17
Henderson, Algo D., 11
Hodgkinson, Harold, 6, 11
Holmes, William, 21
Hunt, Jerald, 15
Johnson, F. Craig, 8
Joughin, Louis, 10
Keeton, Morris, 6, 11
Kroepsch, Robert H., 10
Lee, Eugene C., 10
Lombus, William, 20
Lunsford, Terry, 5, 14
Marcus, Philip, 8
Mason, Henry L., 10
McConnell, T.R., 7, 13
Mitchell, James, 18
Moore, Katherine, 12
Mortimer, Kenneth P., 19
Myerson, Martin, 5
O'Neil, Robert M., 5
Palola, Ernest G., 11
Paltridge, J.G., 14
Perkins, James A., 16
Plumer, Stephen, 6
Reynolds, R. Neil, 15
Riesing, Tom, 12
Roark, Eldridge W., 13
Robinson, Glen, 15
Robinson, Lora H., 15
Schietinger, E.F., 15
Schroeder, Glenn B., 12
Shoenfeld, Janet D., 15
Simms, Paul C., 19
Storr, Richard J., 9
Thompson, Michael L., 14
Toll, John S., 18
Van Alstyne, William W., 20
Van Riper, Paul P., 18
Weimer, Rae O., 20
Welch, Charles, 9
Woolf, William B., 9

Institutions and Sponsoring Agencies

American Academy of Arts and Sciences, 5
American Association for Higher Education, 6
American Association of University Professors, 9, 10
American Bar Association, 14
American Bar Foundation, 14
American Civil Liberties Union, 5
American Council on Education, 5, 6, 7
Antioch College, 20
Antioch Columbia, 6, 11
Bethel College, 16
California Junior College Association, 15, 19
Carnegie Commission on the Future of Higher Education, 9, 10, 11, 12, 16
Carnegie Foundation, 12
Center for Educational Enquiry, 16
Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, 5, 7, 8, 11, 13
City University Construction Fund, 19
Colgate University, 20
Columbia University, 21
Cornell University, 18
Dickinson College, 16
Duke University, 20
ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education, 15
Esso Foundation, 10
Ford Foundation, 5, 12
George Washington University, 18
Harvard University, 21
Illinois State University, 8
Indiana University, 13
Institute for Educational Management, 8
Institute in Higher Education, Claremont Graduate School, 7
Kettering Foundation, 6
Millikin University, 15
National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, 8, 17
National Education Association, 15
National Institutes of Mental Health, 7
New York State Division of Higher Education, 9
North Carolina Board of Higher Education, 9
Northern Illinois University, 14
Ohio University, 21
Princeton University, 19
Purdue University, 13, 19
Robert Earl McConnell Foundation, 21
Rochester Institute of Technology, 9
Rockefeller Foundation, 5
Sloan Foundation, 8
Sloan School of Management, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 12
Southern Regional Education Board, 15
State University of New York, 18
State University of New York Research Foundation, 18
Stern Family Fund, 5
Temple University, 12
Tulane University, 10
United States Office of Education, 5, 7, 8, 11, 13
University of California, Berkeley, 10, 20
University of Chicago, 12
University of Connecticut, 17
University of Florida, Gainesville, 20
University of Michigan, 17
University of Minnesota, 19
University of New Mexico, 17
University of North Carolina, 18
Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, 10
Yale University, 16
York University, 9